

Re Box V.

1. Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: SCHNEIDER G M ET AL: "A simulation study of the OSPF-OMP routing algorithm" COMPUTER NETWORKS, ELSEVIER SCIENCE PUBLISHERS B.V., AMSTERDAM, NL, vol. 39, no. 4, 15 July 2002 (2002-07-15), pages 457-468, XP004359016 ISSN: 1389-1286.

2. CLAIM 1

The document D1 is considered to be the closest prior art. It discloses (the references in brackets relate to this document):

Method for improving traffic distribution in a communication network with multipath routing, said communication network being made up of nodes and links, with one node of the communication network having a number of outgoing links, which correspond to alternative paths for routing to a destination and to which traffic to the destination can be distributed, according to which - distribution weightings for the distribution of the traffic to the destination are assigned to the outgoing links.

from which the subject matter of the independent claim 1 differs in that

- the distribution weightings are adjusted according to a parameter related to the load or availability of the individual links, with, in the case of two links with different parameter values, the distribution weighting of the link with the higher parameter value being reduced in relation to the distribution weighting of the other link.

2.1 The subject matter of claim 1 is therefore novel (Article 33(2) PCT).

The object to be achieved with the present invention can therefore be seen to be that the distribution weightings are to be introduced for the distribution of traffic paths to a destination and these distribution weightings are to be adjusted with a view to achieve optimized traffic distribution.

2.2 The solution for this object proposed in claim 1 of the present application is based for the following reasons on

**WRITTEN OPINION
OF THE INTERNATIONAL
SEARCHING AUTHORITY
(SUPPLEMENTARY SHEET)**

International reference
PCT/EP2005/050087

an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT):
A satisfactory solution to this problem is already
disclosed in the document D1. On analyzing the document D1
the person skilled in the art would therefore find no
reason for any possible modification or improvement.

2.3 Claims 2-15 are dependent on claim 1 and therefore also
satisfy the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty
and inventive step.

3 CLAIM 16

The same justification as in clause 2 applies
correspondingly to the independent claim 16. The subject
matter of claim 16 is therefore novel (Article 33(2) PCT)
and is therefore based on an inventive step (Article 33(3)
PCT).